

Freiburg THEP-94/4
gr-qc/9405039

SEMICLASSICAL GRAVITY AND THE PROBLEM OF TIME¹

Claus Kiefer

Fakultät für Physik, Universität Freiburg,
Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany.

Abstract

I give a brief review of the recovery of semiclassical time from quantum gravity and discuss possible extrapolations of this concept to the full theory.

In his famous volume *The Variational Principles of Mechanics*, Lanczos writes: “We have done considerable mountain climbing. Now we are in the rarefied atmosphere of theories of excessive beauty and we are nearing a high plateau on which geometry, optics, mechanics, and wave mechanics meet on common ground.” Lanczos is here referring to the Hamilton-Jacobi framework of classical mechanics which has proven to be very fruitful for the development of quantum mechanics. In fact, the powerful WKB method which provides a bridge between the classical and the quantum framework makes essential use of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

This approach will also play a central role in my contribution on *Semiclassical Gravity and the Problem of Time*. What is the problem of time? If one quantizes a theory which is invariant with respect to the reparametrization of a time parameter, the dynamical quantum equation is of the form $H\Psi = 0$, where H is the Hamilton operator of the theory. The problem of time is thus the absence of a time *parameter* in this equation. This leads to the question of whether the standard interpretation of quantum theory, which is fundamentally tied to the presence of an external time parameter

¹To appear in the *Proceedings of the Cornelius Lanczos International Centenary Conference*, edited by M. Chu, R. Flemmons, D. Brown, and D. Ellison (SIAM, 1994).

t , can be rescued in such a theory. General relativity, in particular, is a time reparametrization invariant theory, and thus the problem of time becomes acute in quantum gravity.² What, then, is the relevance of semiclassical methods in this context? Firstly, and most important, is the necessity to *derive* the standard notion of time, and with it the Schrödinger equation $H\psi = i\hbar\partial\psi/\partial t$, as an *approximate* notion from the timeless Hamilton constraint equation (the “Wheeler-DeWitt equation”) referred to above.³ Secondly, one may possibly get some insight, from semiclassical gravity, into the interpretation of full quantum gravity.

I first want to focus on the recovery of standard time. To this purpose it is convenient to write the Wheeler-DeWitt equation in the form

$$\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}G_{abcd}\frac{\delta^2}{\delta h_{ab}\delta h_{cd}} + MV + \mathcal{H}_m\right)\Psi = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $M \equiv c^2/32\pi G$, $V = -2c^2\sqrt{\hbar}(R-2\Lambda)$, and $\mathcal{H}_m$ is the matter Hamiltonian density. The semiclassical approximation to quantum gravity is based on the assumption that M in (1) is large compared to the corresponding scales (masses, energies, ...) in the matter Hamiltonian. One can then perform a Born-Oppenheimer type of expansion scheme, in which the gravitational degrees of freedom take over the role usually played by the nuclei, and the remaining fields play the role of the electrons.

Writing the total wave functional in the form $\Psi \equiv \exp(iS/\hbar)$, and expanding S in powers of M , $S = MS_0 + S_1 + M^{-1}S_2 + \dots$, one finds, first, that S_0 obeys the *Hamilton-Jacobi equation for gravity*. Since this equation is equivalent to the field equations of general relativity, one may say that the notion of a classical spacetime has been recovered at this order (to each solution S_0 of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation corresponds a whole class of spacetimes as “trajectories of three-geometries” in configuration space). One can construct a *particular* spacetime by first calculating the geometrodynamical momentum from S_0 , $\pi^{ab} \equiv M\delta S_0/\delta h_{ab}$, and then finding from it the “velocity” $\dot{h}_{ab}$ by specifying lapse and shift function. Given some “ini-

²For a detailed discussion of the problem of time in quantum gravity, see C. J. Isham, in *Integrable Systems, Quantum Groups, and Quantum Field Theories* (Kluwer, London, 1992), and K. V. Kuchař, in *Proceedings of the 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, edited by G. Kunstatter et al (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992), as well as other contributions to the present volume.

³A detailed exposition on semiclassical gravity can be found in my contribution to *Canonical Gravity - From Classical to Quantum*, edited by J. Ehlers and H. Friedrich (Springer, Berlin, 1994).

tial” three-geometry, one can then integrate the equations of motion to find a whole spacetime with a *definite* foliation and a *definite* choice of coordinates on each member of the foliation. If one writes the wave functional in the next order in the form

$$\Psi \approx C[h_{ab}] \exp(iMS_0[h_{ab}]/\hbar) \chi[h_{ab}, \phi], \quad (2)$$

where C is a real prefactor, and ϕ stands symbolically for non-gravitational fields, the functional χ obeys an approximate Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \int d^3x G_{abcd} \frac{\delta S_0}{\delta h_{ab}} \frac{\delta \chi}{\delta h_{cd}} \equiv i\hbar \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial t} = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}_m \chi. \quad (3)$$

The “WKB time” t is defined on configuration space, but also yields – by the construction given above – a time parameter in each of the spacetimes which follow from a choice of S_0 . I emphasize that there is no “spacetime problem” (see Ref. 1) in the semiclassical approximation, since a specific foliation of the spacetime has been chosen at the previous order of approximation. Moreover, the fact that WKB time cannot be defined globally (“global time problem”) is of no importance in the semiclassical approximation, since the Schrödinger equation (3) is expected to hold only in restricted regions of superspace.

One might wonder what would happen if a *superposition* of wave functionals of the form (2) is considered. One might, in particular, wish to consider a superposition of (2) with its complex conjugate, which seems to be more natural in view of the real nature of Eq. (1). In fact, due to the presence of interference terms, there would be no definite spacetime, and one would not be able to derive the Schrödinger equation (3) from such a superposition. How, then, is it possible to understand the emergence of a classical world? The key observation in the resolution of this “paradox” is provided by the presence of a huge number of degrees of freedom (such as gravitational waves and matter density fluctuations) which couple differently to the e^{iS_0} and e^{-iS_0} part of the superposition. Since only very few of these degrees of freedom can be taken into account in a practical observation, information about interference terms migrates into correlations between the gravitational “background part” and the remaining “reservoir” – the terms in the superposition *decohere* from one another.⁴

It is important to note that, due to the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, the unobservable degrees of freedom distinguish between the *complex*

⁴C. Kiefer, Phys. Rev. D 47, 5414 (1993).

components e^{iS_0} and e^{-iS_0} and *not* between real components such as $\cos S_0$ and $\sin S_0$. This is an important example for the mechanism of *symmetry breaking*⁵ – while the full Hamiltonian in (1) is invariant under complex conjugation, the actual “classical state” (2) is not. This is in close analogy to molecular physics, where the Hamiltonian is invariant under space reflection but the actual state can have a definite chirality (this happens, e.g., in the case of sugar). In the same way does time emerge from the timeless equation (1) by symmetry breaking.

What happens with the concept of WKB time if one proceeds to the next order in M ? It is clear that now the phase of the functional χ is involved in addition to S_0 . In concreto, one defines a “corrected WKB time” $\tilde{t}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{t}} &\equiv i\hbar \int d^3x G_{abcd} \left(\frac{\delta S_0}{\delta h_{ab}} + \frac{1}{M} \langle \chi | \frac{\delta \theta}{\delta h_{ab}} \chi \rangle \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{cd}} \\ &= i\hbar \int d^3x G_{abcd} \left(\frac{\delta S_0}{\delta h_{ab}} - \frac{1}{M} \langle \chi | \mathcal{H}_m \chi \rangle \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{cd}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where θ is the phase of $\chi \equiv Re^{i\theta/\hbar}$. One recognizes in (4) the appearance of the “back reaction term” $\langle \mathcal{H}_m \rangle$ which also appears in the corresponding modification of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (and, consequently, in the Einstein field equations). Instead of (3) one finds at this order a Schrödinger equation with additional correction terms which are proportional to the gravitational constant. I emphasize that one contribution to these correction terms follows directly from the modification (4) of WKB time at this order (see, again, Ref. 2 for details). Similarly, one has to take into account the phase of the total wave functional up to order M^{-k} in the definition of WKB time, if one considers terms up to order $M^{-(k+1)}$ in the corrected Schrödinger equation. I should mention that one is able to extract physical predictions from these correction terms, such as energy shifts, and non-unitary contributions to black hole evaporation.

I will now focus on the second issue of my contribution: In what sense can one extrapolate the notion of semiclassical time to full quantum gravity? Motivated by the above considerations, a number of authors⁶ have attempted to *define* time in the full theory through the exact phase of the total wave functional, which is supposed to satisfy the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (1). This “phase time”, t_p , defines a flow in configuration space which, of

⁵H. D. Zeh, in *Stochastic evolution of quantum states in open systems and measurement processes* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).

⁶J. Greensite, Nucl. Phys. **B 342**, 409 (1990); T. Padmanabhan, Pramana **35**, L 199 (1990); E. J. Squires, Phys. Lett. **A 155**, 357 (1991).

course, in general has no connection with any classical spacetime. If one performs a coordinate transformation in configuration space, $(h_{ab}, \phi) \rightarrow (t_p, y)$, where y are “comoving coordinates”, one can define expectation values according to

$$\langle A(y) \rangle \equiv \int \mathcal{D}\mu[y] \Psi^*(t_p, y) A \Psi(t_p, y) \quad (5)$$

and show that $\langle A \rangle$ satisfies an Ehrenfest equation $i\hbar \partial \langle A \rangle / \partial t_p = \langle [A, \tilde{H}] \rangle$, where $\tilde{H}$ is an effective Hamiltonian whose precise form, however, has to be determined from a given solution to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation.

In the semiclassical approximation t_p agrees, of course, with WKB time. If the approximation scheme is continued to higher orders, the modified WKB times are still in close analogy to phase time. Such a connection is lost in generic situations where the notion of semiclassical time is not available.

There are, however, some open problems with this approach to the concept of time. Firstly, one cannot define phase time for a real solution of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation. One might again wish to invoke some kind of decoherence and define phase time in various complex components of the total wave function, but this is much less clear than in the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. Secondly, in contrast to the semiclassical approximation, phase time may depend upon the choice of the original spacetime foliation and thus may give rise to the “spacetime problem” (see Ref. 1). Thirdly, the second Ehrenfest equation (the one with respect to momentum) does not hold generally, but only if the phase obeys some additional condition. Finally, time would not be a concept independent of the chosen solution to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation. The viability of this approach thus remains unclear.

I want to conclude with a brief comment on the relation of WKB time to “intrinsic time.” The latter notion refers to the fundamental equation (1) itself which through its local minus signs in the kinetic part distinguishes locally one function of the three-metric (the local scale part) as being “time-like”. In special regions in configuration space (for example, in the case of Friedmann universes) only one minus sign remains, and the Wheeler-DeWitt equation becomes hyperbolic with respect to intrinsic time. While intrinsic time may in fact coincide with WKB time for parts of the evolution of a Friedmann Universe, they will not coincide globally. This, then, has important consequences for the understanding of the arrow of time in quantum

cosmology.⁷

⁷H. D. Zeh, *The physical basis of the direction of time* (Springer, Berlin, 1992).